

EVIDENCE IN VIRGO FOR THE UNIVERSAL DARK MATTER HALO

Dean E. McLaughlin¹

Department of Astronomy, 601 Campbell Hall
University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3411
dean@crabneb.berkeley.edu

ABSTRACT

A model is constructed for the mass and dynamics of M87 and the Virgo Cluster. Existing surface photometry of the galaxy, mass estimates from X-ray observations of the hot intracluster gas, and the velocity dispersions of early-type Virgo galaxies, all are used to constrain the run of dark matter density over $0 \leq r \lesssim 2$ Mpc in the cluster. The “universal” halo advocated by Navarro, Frenk, & White, $\rho_{\text{dm}} \propto (r/r_s)^{-1}(1 + r/r_s)^{-2}$, provides an excellent description of the combined data, as does a Hernquist profile with $\rho_{\text{dm}} \propto (r/r_s)^{-1}(1 + r/r_s)^{-3}$. These models are favored over isothermal spheres, and their central structure is preferred to density cusps either much stronger or much weaker than r^{-1} . The galaxies and gas in the cluster trace its total mass distribution ($\rho_{\text{gal}} \propto \rho_{\text{gas}} \propto \rho_{\text{dm}}$), the galaxies’ velocity ellipsoid is close to isotropic, and the gas temperature follows the virial temperature profile of the dark halo. The virial radius and mass and the intracluster gas fraction of Virgo are evaluated.

Subject headings: dark matter — galaxies: clusters: general — galaxies: clusters: individual (Virgo) — galaxies: individual (M87) — intergalactic medium

1. Introduction

Some recent simulations of structure formation in CDM universes have suggested that dark matter halos generally form with a “universal” density profile, in which $\rho_{\text{dm}} \propto (r/r_s)^{-1}(1 + r/r_s)^{-2}$ (Navarro, Frenk, & White 1997, hereafter NFW). However, this claim has been questioned by other numerical work (e.g., Anninos & Norman 1996; Kravtsov et al. 1998); in particular, Moore et al. (1998) find instead that $\rho_{\text{dm}} \rightarrow r^{-1.4}$ as $r \rightarrow 0$ in a set of highly resolved N-body halos. The little *observational* evidence that has been brought to bear on this issue is also ambiguous; e.g., the basic form of the NFW halo appears to apply in CNOC clusters of galaxies (Carlberg et al. 1997), but not in the dwarf galaxy DDO154 (Burkert & Silk 1997). This *Letter* tests the viability of the proposed universal halo, among other models for the dark matter distribution, in the nearby Virgo Cluster ($D = 15$ Mpc; Pierce et al. 1994).

¹Hubble Fellow

The X-ray emission from Virgo, which is centered on the cD galaxy M87, has been used many times to constrain mass models for the cluster core (Nulsen & Böhringer 1995, and references therein). Here, an attempt is made to supplement this standard analysis with larger-scale constraints on $\rho_{\text{dm}}(r)$ from the spatial distribution and dynamics of the galaxies in Virgo. To do so, the infalling late-type galaxies that are responsible for much of the cluster’s irregular optical structure are excluded from analysis. Instead, reference will be made only to the *early* Hubble types in Virgo, which are spatially concentrated (about a point $\sim 1^\circ$ NW of M87) with a roughly Gaussian velocity distribution (centered near the velocity of M87), and which therefore suggest the existence of a relatively smooth and relaxed underlying mass distribution (see Binggeli, Tammann, & Sandage 1987). In what follows, this is essentially adopted as a postulate. It is further assumed that Virgo is spherically symmetric and centered on M87. This is a reasonable first-order characterization of the X-ray structure around the galaxy, and will serve as a coarse-average approximation to the overall cluster structure. As part of this, the apparent offset between M87 and the centroid of the early-type galaxy isopleths is taken *not* to reflect a large perturbation in the fundamental mass distribution, and is ignored. While imperfect, these simplifications ultimately admit a model for Virgo that is of interest both for its basic structure—the central scaling $\rho_{\text{dm}} \propto r^{-1}$ of NFW is indicated, and is favored clearly over the steeper cusps of either Moore et al. (1998) or a singular isothermal sphere—and for the relations it suggests between the galaxies, gas, and dark matter in this cluster.

2. Data and Halo Models

A significant contribution to the total mass on the smallest spatial scales in Virgo comes from the stars in M87 itself. With the *stellar* (core) mass-to-light ratio of this galaxy known (van der Marel 1991), and taken to be independent of radius, the mass density profile $\rho_{\text{M87}}(r)$ follows from the *B*-band surface photometry of de Vaucouleurs & Nieto (1978), which extends to $R \simeq 100$ kpc. (Here and throughout, three-dimensional radii are denoted by r , and projected radii by R .) Specifically, fitting μ_B with density models from the family discussed by Dehnen (1993) and Tremaine et al. (1994) yields the profile defined in Table 1 (for $D = 15$ Mpc, and with $A_B = 0.09$ mag of extinction [Burstein & Heiles 1984] taken into account). Note that this model closely approximates a standard $R^{1/4}$ law in projection (see Dehnen 1993).

Moving outwards, density and temperature profiles for the hot gas within $10 \lesssim r \lesssim 200$ kpc of M87 have been obtained from *ROSAT* PSPC observations by Nulsen & Böhringer (1995, hereafter NB95). Their analysis assumes homogeneity, or a single-phase medium, which could be a potential source of error *if* a cooling flow has produced a multiphase gas in Virgo; however, this possibility appears to be of concern only at radii near the low end of the range in the *ROSAT* data (viz. $r \lesssim 15$ kpc: Canizares et al. 1982; Tsai 1994). Thus, use is made here of the *model-independent* gravitating mass profile, $M_{\text{tot}}(r)$, which NB95 derive by applying the standard assumption of hydrostatic equilibrium to their $\rho_{\text{gas}}(r)$ and $T(r)$ measurements.

Still further out, the (azimuthally averaged) surface density of dwarf ellipticals in Virgo is given by Binggeli et al. (1987), who find $N_{\text{gal}}(R) \propto [1 + (R/410 \text{ kpc})^2]^{-1}$ for $100 \text{ kpc} \lesssim R \lesssim 1.5 \text{ Mpc}$. (The distribution of E/S0 systems, though somewhat more irregular in detail, is also consistent with this average profile.) The offset between the X-ray and optical centroids of Virgo is small enough—about half a core radius, and not much larger than M87 itself—that the same $N_{\text{gal}}(R)$ applies to galaxy counts taken in rings centered on either point. Binggeli et al.’s parametrization then implies a three-dimensional $n_{\text{gal}}(r) \propto [1 + (r/410 \text{ kpc})^2]^{-3/2}$. The galaxy data *do not* require this constant-density core, however; they are equally well fit by projections of either a Hernquist (1990) profile, $n_{\text{gal}}(r) \propto (r/1.1 \text{ Mpc})^{-1}(1 + r/1.1 \text{ Mpc})^{-3}$, or an NFW profile, $n_{\text{gal}} \propto (r/560 \text{ kpc})^{-1}(1 + r/560 \text{ kpc})^{-2}$ (cf. Fig. 2 below).

Finally, Girardi et al. (1996) use the velocities of 180 early-type Virgo galaxies to measure the *aperture* velocity dispersion, σ_{ap} —the r.m.s. line-of-sight velocity for all objects within a given distance from M87—as a function of R from $\simeq 200 \text{ kpc}$ to 2 Mpc . Essentially the same $\sigma_{\text{ap}}(R)$ profile is obtained with circular apertures taken about the optical center of Virgo instead (cf. Fadda et al. 1996).

Given these data, a parametric model for the dark matter halo may be specified as $\rho_{\text{dm}}(r) \equiv K f(r/r_s)$, with f a dimensionless form function. It is then convenient to refer the halo’s normalization and scale to the observed stellar quantities in M87 (Table 1). Thus, with $D \equiv \pi a^3 K / \Upsilon_B L_B$ and $\eta \equiv r_s/a$, the mass interior to any radius is

$$M_{\text{tot}}(r) = \Upsilon_B L_B \left[\left(\frac{r/a}{1 + r/a} \right)^{3-\gamma} + 4D\eta^3 \int_0^{r/r_s} f(u)u^2 du \right], \quad (1)$$

in which D and η are fixed by fitting to the observed mass profile at $r \lesssim 200 \text{ kpc}$. If a good fit is achieved, no free parameters are left in the model, and it remains only to check its extrapolation to larger radii against the dynamics of the early-type galaxies. To this end, the observed $n_{\text{gal}}(r)$ (from any of the functional fits mentioned above) and the model $M_{\text{tot}}(r)$ are used to solve the spherical Jeans equation for the radial velocity dispersion of the galaxies:

$$n_{\text{gal}}\sigma_r^2(r) = \exp\left(-\int \frac{2\beta_{\text{gal}}}{r} dr\right) \times \left[\int_r^\infty n_{\text{gal}} \frac{GM_{\text{tot}}}{x^2} \exp\left(\int \frac{2\beta_{\text{gal}}}{x} dx\right) dx \right], \quad (2)$$

where $\beta_{\text{gal}}(r) \equiv 1 - \sigma_\theta^2/\sigma_r^2$ is the usual measure of orbital anisotropy. The dispersion along any single line of sight then follows from the projection

$$N_{\text{gal}}\sigma_p^2(R) = 2 \int_R^\infty n_{\text{gal}}\sigma_r^2(r) \left(1 - \beta_{\text{gal}} \frac{R^2}{r^2}\right) \frac{r dr}{\sqrt{r^2 - R^2}}, \quad (3)$$

with $N_{\text{gal}}(R) = 2 \int_R^\infty n_{\text{gal}}(r^2 - R^2)^{-1/2} r dr$. Finally,

$$\sigma_{\text{ap}}^2(R) = \left(\int_0^R N_{\text{gal}}\sigma_p^2(x) x dx \right) \left(\int_0^R N_{\text{gal}}(x) x dx \right)^{-1} \quad (4)$$

is compared with the observed aperture velocity dispersion profile at $R \gtrsim 200$ kpc. If this comparison is unsatisfactory, but the basic assumption of dynamical equilibrium is retained, then the underlying form of $\rho_{\text{dm}}(r)$ may be rejected. A potential complication is that the orbital anisotropy of the galaxies is not known a priori, and a given $f(r/r_s)$ can safely be discarded only if it cannot reproduce the empirical $\sigma_{\text{ap}}(R)$ for *any* assumed $\beta_{\text{gal}}(r)$. Fortunately, the Virgo data prove to be quite consistent with a simple $\beta_{\text{gal}} \equiv 0$, i.e., isotropic orbits.

3. Results

The field of possible halo profiles can be narrowed somewhat by first requiring consistency with a small subset of the data: from NB95 and Girardi et al. (1996),

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\text{tot}}(r \lesssim 30 \text{ kpc}) &= (1.6_{-0.7}^{+0.3}) \times 10^{12} M_{\odot} \\ M_{\text{tot}}(r \lesssim 150 \text{ kpc}) &= (1.9 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{13} M_{\odot} \\ \sigma_{\text{ap}}(R \leq 2 \text{ Mpc}) &= 640_{-65}^{+85} \text{ kms}^{-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where all uncertainties are $\simeq 2\text{-}\sigma$ limits. Figure 1 illustrates tests of four different form functions against these three constraints only: in panel (a), $f(r/r_s) = [1 + (r/r_s)^2]^{-1}$ (an isothermal sphere with a core; cf. NB95); in (b), $f(r/r_s) = (r/r_s)^{-0.5}(1 + r/r_s)^{-2.5}$; in panel (c), $f(r/r_s) = (r/r_s)^{-1}(1 + r/r_s)^{-2}$ (the model of NFW); and in (d), $f(r/r_s) = (r/r_s)^{-1.5}(1 + r/r_s)^{-1.5}$ (as in the N-body simulations of Moore et al. 1998). The different line types in each panel contain combinations of D and η that are consistent (for $\beta_{\text{gal}} \equiv 0$) with the $2\text{-}\sigma$ limits on the *individual* data points in equation (5); the various dots identify models which yield the best estimates for both members of different data *pairs*. A minimally self-consistent model for ρ_{dm} must draw its normalization and scale length from the intersection of the three bands in the appropriate panel of Fig. 1, and ideally the three dots should coincide at a unique (η, D) .

Panel (d) of Fig. 1 shows that a central cusp as steep as $r^{-1.5}$ (Moore et al. 1998) cannot easily account for the observed M_{tot} inside both 30 kpc and 150 kpc: the implied $M_{\text{dm}} \propto r^{1.5}$ at small r is *shallower* than what is inferred from the observed excess of $M_{\text{tot}}(r)$ over the stellar $M_{\text{M87}}(r)$. This is even more of a problem for the singular isothermal sphere ($\rho_{\text{dm}} \propto r^{-2}$ and $M_{\text{dm}} \propto r$), which is altogether inconsistent with the X-ray masses (see also NB95). On the other hand, the mass constraints at $r \lesssim 200$ kpc are satisfied by any of the halos with central $\rho_{\text{dm}} \propto r^{-1}$ or shallower; but the weak cusps in panels (a) and (b) give the best agreement for scale radii r_s that are so small [to limit a *steeply* rising $M_{\text{dm}}(r)$] as to imply total halo masses which are too low to support the velocity dispersion of the Virgo galaxies on large spatial scales.² Thus,

²This conclusion is insensitive to the assumed form of ρ_{dm} as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Also, while some shallow-cusp models with radial anisotropy ($0 < \beta_{\text{gal}} \leq 1$) can reproduce the observed σ_{ap} at $R = 2$ Mpc, they are inconsistent with the full *profile* at smaller radii.

the “universal” halo of NFW, with its central $\rho_{\text{dm}} \propto r^{-1}$ and with $\beta_{\text{gal}} \equiv 0$, emerges as the best candidate for a self-consistent description of the Virgo Cluster [panel (c)].

This simple analysis is limited in two respects. (1) At very small $r \lesssim 10\text{--}15$ kpc, where $M_{\text{M87}}(r) \gg M_{\text{dm}}(r)$, the halo could depart from $\rho_{\text{dm}} \propto r^{-1}$ and not conflict with any observations. And (2) little can be said about the behavior of ρ_{dm} in the limit $r \rightarrow \infty$; for example, the same procedure that leads to Fig. 1 shows that the profile of Hernquist (1990), $\rho_{\text{dm}} \propto (r/r_s)^{-1}(1+r/r_s)^{-3}$ (as suggested by the early simulations of Dubinski & Carlberg 1991), is just as acceptable as the NFW $\rho_{\text{dm}} \propto (r/r_s)^{-1}(1+r/r_s)^{-2}$ in Virgo. The best fits of these two models have different *parameters* (given in Table 1), but show no real *physical* differences on $\lesssim 2$ Mpc scales.

Figure 2 compares the full sets of data discussed in §2 with models using the best-fit NFW and Hernquist halos. The top panel shows the best X-ray estimate and 95% confidence limits for $M_{\text{tot}}(r)$ (dashed line and bold curves), along with results from optical spectroscopy of the stars in M87 (Sargent et al. 1978; filled triangles) and from radial velocities of its globular clusters (Cohen & Ryzhov 1997; open triangles). These latter sets of data independently corroborate the models. (The globular cluster dynamics specifically will be discussed in a future paper.) The middle panel of Fig. 2 then compares the surface density profile of early-type galaxies with that of each fit to the dark matter halo. This shows—the analysis *did not assume*—that $n_{\text{gal}} \propto \rho_{\text{dm}}$ in Virgo. This fact is used to compute aperture dispersion profiles that, for $\beta_{\text{gal}} \equiv 0$, show excellent agreement with the data in the bottom of Fig. 2. It also allows the uncertainties on η in Table 1 to be estimated by fitting the projection of $\rho_{\text{dm}}(r)$ to $N_{\text{gal}}(R)$; the limits on D then follow from plots like panel (c) of Fig. 1.

In either of these models, the virial radius of the dark matter halo—roughly, that within which its mean density is 200 times the critical density for closure—is $r_{200} = 1.55 \pm 0.06$ Mpc (for $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$), corresponding to a mass of $M_{\text{dm}}(r_{200}) = (4.2 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{14} M_{\odot}$. This emphasizes that the dark matter (and the gas) around M87 is associated—by construction—with the whole of Virgo; and this weakens previous arguments (Binggeli et al. 1987) which suggested that the cluster could not be relaxed.

Finally, Fig. 3 shows that the hot gas within 200 kpc of M87 directly traces the distribution of dark matter (and galaxies) in Virgo: $\rho_{\text{gas}}/\rho_{\text{dm}} \simeq 0.035 (D/15 \text{ Mpc})^{1.5}$. If this is assumed to hold throughout the entire cluster, then the similarity of its total stellar and gas masses (Arnaud et al. 1992) implies a global baryon fraction of $\sim 7\%$, roughly in line with other low-temperature clusters (Arnaud & Evrard 1998). The bottom of Fig. 3 also shows a close agreement between the observed gas temperatures and the virial temperature, $kT(r) = 0.6 m_H \sigma_r^2(r)$, of the dark matter halo. Thus, simple virialization of gas that traces the dark matter in an r^{-1} halo suffices to explain the density and temperature structure of the intracluster medium at the center of Virgo. This suggests—if an NFW-type halo truly is universal, and if the proportionality $\rho_{\text{gas}} \propto \rho_{\text{dm}}$ is typical—that central density cusps and temperature drops in the gas of X-ray clusters *may not, by themselves, prove the existence of cooling flows*. That said, however, radiative cooling times are

unequivocally short in the core of Virgo ($t_{\text{cool}} \lesssim 10^{10}$ yr for $r \lesssim 70$ kpc); and it remains to be seen whether a single-phase gas virialized in an NFW halo can account for the low-energy X-ray line fluxes observed there, or if these still require mass drop-out and the development of a multiphase medium at small radii in a cooling flow (cf. Tsai 1994).

Of course, Virgo by itself cannot establish the “universality” of a central $\rho_{\text{dm}} \propto r^{-1}$ structure, even among only cluster-sized halos. It is worth noting, then, that clusters at $z \simeq 0.3$ in the CNOC survey are also well fit by an NFW model for the dark matter (Carlberg et al. 1997). Moreover, the NFW concentration of Virgo, $c \equiv r_{200}/r_s = 2.8 \pm 0.7$, is consistent with that of the CNOC clusters. This c seems low, however, by comparison with Λ -CDM simulations of halo evolution (NFW; Thomas et al. 1998). The physical origin of this discrepancy—and, for that matter, of the r^{-1} cusp itself—is unclear.

Marisa Girardi provided the velocity dispersion data plotted in Figure 2, and an anonymous referee offered many helpful comments. This work was supported by NASA through grant number HF-1097.01-97A awarded by the Space Telescope Science Institute, which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., for NASA under contract NAS5-26555.

REFERENCES

- Anninos, P., & Norman, M. L. 1996, *ApJ*, 459, 12
- Arnaud, M., & Evrard, A. E. 1998, *MNRAS*, in press (astro-ph/9806353)
- Arnaud, M., Rothenflug, R., Boulade, O., Vigroux, L., & Vangioni-Flam, E. 1992, *A&A*, 254, 49
- Binggeli, B., Tammann, G. A., & Sandage, A. 1987, *AJ*, 94, 251
- Burkert, A., & Silk, J. 1997, *ApJ*, 488, L55
- Burstein, D., & Heiles, C. 1984, *ApJS*, 54, 33
- Canizares, C. R., Clark, G. W., Jernigan, J. G., & Markert, T. H. 1982, *ApJ*, 262, 33
- Carlberg, R. G., et al. 1997, *ApJ*, 485, L13
- Cohen, J. G., & Ryzhov, A. 1997, *ApJ*, 486, 230
- de Vaucouleurs, G., & Nieto, J.-L. 1978, *ApJ*, 220, 449
- Dehnen, W. 1993, *MNRAS*, 265, 250
- Dubinski, J., & Carlberg, R. G. 1991, *ApJ*, 378, 496
- Fadda, D., Girardi, M., Giuricin, G., Mardirossian, F., & Mezzetti, M. 1996, *ApJ*, 473, 670
- Girardi, M., Fadda, D., Giuricin, G., Mardirossian, M., Mezzetti, M., & Biviano, A. 1996, *ApJ*, 457, 61
- Hernquist, L. 1990, *ApJ*, 356, 359
- Kravtsov, A. V., Klypin, A. A., Bullock, J. S., & Primack, J. R. 1998, *ApJ*, 502, 48
- Moore, B., Governato, F., Quinn, T., Stadel, J., & Lake, G. 1998, *ApJ*, 499, L5
- Navarro, J. F., Frenk, C. S., & White, S. D. M. 1997, *ApJ*, 490, 493 (NFW)
- Nulsen, P. E. J., & Böhringer, H. 1995, *MNRAS*, 274, 1093 (NB95)
- Pierce, M. J., Welch, D. L., McClure, R. D., van den Bergh, S., Racine, R., & Stetson, P. B. 1994, *Nature*, 371, 385
- Sargent, W. L. W., Young, P. J., Boksenberg, A., Shortridge, K., Lynds, C. R., & Hartwick, F. D. A. 1978, *ApJ*, 221, 731
- Thomas, P. A., et al. 1998, *MNRAS*, 296, 1061
- Tremaine, S., Richstone, D. O., Byun, Y.-I., Dressler, A., Faber, S. M., Grillmair, C., Kormendy, J., & Lauer, T. R. 1994, *AJ*, 107, 634
- Tsai, J. C. 1994, *ApJ*, 429, 119
- van der Marel, R. P. 1991, *MNRAS*, 253, 710

Fig. 1.— Tests of four different models for the dark matter halo in Virgo. In each panel, solid lines contain all (η, D) pairs which (by eq. [1]) satisfy the $2\text{-}\sigma$ *limits* on $M_{\text{tot}}(30\text{ kpc})$; dashed lines contain those which satisfy the limits on $M_{\text{tot}}(150\text{ kpc})$; and dotted lines contain those which (by eqs. [2]–[4]) satisfy the limits on $\sigma_{\text{ap}}(2\text{ Mpc})$. Circles in each case mark the single (η, D) pair that yields the *best estimates* for both $M_{\text{tot}}(30\text{ kpc})$ and $M_{\text{tot}}(150\text{ kpc})$ [there is no such pair for the steep central cusp in (d)]; triangles yield the best $M_{\text{tot}}(30\text{ kpc})$ and the best $\sigma_{\text{ap}}(2\text{ Mpc})$; and squares give the best $M_{\text{tot}}(150\text{ kpc})$ and $\sigma_{\text{ap}}(2\text{ Mpc})$.

Fig. 2.— Comparison of best-fit mass models with the Virgo data (scaled for an assumed distance of 15 Mpc), for both NFW and Hernquist (1990) dark matter distributions. Parameters for the NFW halo follow from panel (c) of Fig. 1; those for the Hernquist halo come from a similar procedure. The dotted lines in the top panel trace the separate mass components $M_{\text{M87}}(r)$ and $M_{\text{dm}}(r)$. In the middle panel, the profile of E/S0 galaxies has been scaled to that of the dE’s according to the ratio (697/56) of their total populations in Binggeli et al. (1987).

Fig. 3.— Comparison of dark matter and intracluster gas density and temperature profiles. Data and $(2\text{-}\sigma)$ errorbars are those from rings 2 through 37 of NB95. Points in the innermost annulus are somewhat uncertain, due to possible contamination by emission from the center of M87, while densities in the outermost one or two annuli may suffer from an inaccurate correction for background emission (NB95). Curves in the bottom panel trace the virial temperature profile of the dark matter halo, in the total potential arising from $\rho_{\text{M87}} + \rho_{\text{dm}}$. See NB95 for discussion of the $T(r)$ measurements.

Table 1. Mass Model for the Virgo Cluster

$\rho_{\text{M87}} = \frac{3-\gamma}{4} \frac{\Upsilon_B L_B}{\pi a^3} \left(\frac{r}{a}\right)^{-\gamma} \left(1 + \frac{r}{a}\right)^{\gamma-4}$ $M_{\text{M87}} = \Upsilon_B L_B \left(\frac{r/a}{1+r/a}\right)^{3-\gamma}$	$\gamma = 1.33 \quad a = 5.1 \pm 0.6 \text{ kpc}$ $L_B = (5.55 \pm 0.50) \times 10^{10} L_{\odot, B}$ $\Upsilon_B = 14.6 \pm 0.2 M_{\odot} L_{\odot, B}^{-1}$
$\rho_{\text{dm}} = K \left(\frac{r}{r_s}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{r}{r_s}\right)^{-2}$ $M_{\text{dm}} = 4\pi K r_s^3 \left[\ln \left(1 + \frac{r}{r_s}\right) - \left(\frac{r/r_s}{1+r/r_s}\right) \right]$	$K = (3.2^{+2.6}_{-1.3}) \times 10^{-4} M_{\odot} \text{ pc}^{-3}$ $D = \pi a^3 K / \Upsilon_B L_B = (1.65^{+1.35}_{-0.70}) \times 10^{-4}$ $r_s = 560^{+150}_{-200} \text{ kpc} \quad \eta = r_s/a = 110^{+30}_{-40}$
$\rho_{\text{dm}} = K \left(\frac{r}{r_s}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{r}{r_s}\right)^{-3}$ $M_{\text{dm}} = 2\pi K r_s^3 \left(\frac{r/r_s}{1+r/r_s}\right)^2$	$K = (1.6 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-4} M_{\odot} \text{ pc}^{-3}$ $D = \pi a^3 K / \Upsilon_B L_B = (8.1 \pm 3.6) \times 10^{-5}$ $r_s = 1.07^{+0.20}_{-0.36} \text{ Mpc} \quad \eta = r_s/a = 210^{+40}_{-70}$





